DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 997 EA 016 023

AUTHOR Pflum, Glenn D.; Brown, Robert D.
TITLE The Effects of Conflict, Quality and Time on Small Group Information Use and Behavior in Evaluative Decision-Making Situations.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; *Group Behavior; *Group Dynamics; *Information Needs; *Simulation; Time

ABSTRACT

This study investigated information needs and use by groups in decision-making processes. Problem contexts were varied by conflict, quality, and time conditions and presented to 89 graduate level education students who simulated school board members making decisions about educational programs. The research hypotheses were: (1) there are no significant differences in need or use of information in decision-making and (2) there are no significant differences in perceptions of group process or behavior. Some findings include: (1) interactions of conflict and quality do produce a need for more information and time, (2) conflict and time interaction affect preference to talk to other board members, and (3) changes in situational contexts affect information need and use in small decision-making groups. The authors discuss the limitations of the study, pointing out the weaknesses inherent in simulation research. (MD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Glenn D. Pflum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE EFFECTS OF CONFLICT, QUALITY AND TIME ON SMALL GROUP INFORMATION USE AND BEHAVIOR IN EVALUATIVE DECISION-MAKING SITUATIONS

Glenn D. Pflum, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
1201 "E" Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

Robert D. Brown, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Educational Psychology and Social Foundations
31 Teachers College
Lincoln, NE 68588-0440

1982

EA 016 023

THE EFFECTS OF CONFLICT, QUALITY AND TIME
ON SMALL GROUP INFORMATION USE AND BEHAVIOR
IN EVALUATIVE DECISION-MAKING SITUATIONS

Abstract

Graduate students simulated school board members making decisions about educational programs. Situation contexts within the program evaluation reports were varied by conflict (high, low), quality (high, low) and time (long, short). ANOVA of the qualitative measures in the 2X2X2 factorial design indicated significant results at the .01 level. The quality of decisions affect support for program continuation. Interactions of conflict and quality affected need for more information and more time in decision making. A conflict and time interaction affected preference to talk to other board members. Changes in situational contexts affected information need and use in small, decision-making groups.

THE EFFECTS OF CONFLICT, QUALITY AND TIME ON SMALL GROUP INFORMATION USE AND BEHAVIOR IN EVALUATIVE DECISION-MAKING SITUATIONS

Research on program evaluation has recently begun to consider what information is needed and used by decision makers to make decisions (Braskamp & Brown, 1980; Patton, 1978; Stecher, Alkin & Flesher, 1981). The research conducted by Patton (1978) examined how evaluation reports were utilized in the decision-making process, if they were used at all. Stecher, et al. (1981) also studied how evaluation reports were utilized by decision makers. Newman (1980) used the communication model of Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) to study and discuss how information is presented to whom by whom in an evaluation report. The work of the evaluator includes determining what information is needed by the decision maker, obtaining that information which is needed, and presenting the information in a useful way in the evaluation report. If the evaluator knows what information will best enable the decision maker to make a decision, this will enhance the usefulness of the report. If changes in the situation or problem contexts affect the information needed and used, the evaluator can adjust the information which is included in the report based on the situational contexts. This would also enhance the usefulness of the evaluation.

Most social service agencies have a governing board made of a group of individuals. These decision-making groups often receive information about a program from an evaluation report. Whether or not an evaluation is utilized may depend on how well it meets the needs of the decision makers. A group making decisions about different problems in different kinds of situations may experience related psycho-emotional states. Would these groups then need and/or utilize information differently dependent on the psycho-emotional states generated by the situational contexts of the decision? If so, knowing this would help the evaluator to determine the information that would be of use to a group in the evaluation report.

Educators and school boards are a visible decision-making group. School board members make critical decisions involving large sums of money to be spent over a period of time, educational or curricular reform of minor or major impact, and the hiring and firing of personnel. Research findings on school boards and educational administrators by Brown, Newman, Rivers and Glock (1982) and Blanchard (1975) suggest that the contextual factors in a problem affect the decision and the process by which it is reached.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the possible effects on information needed and used in groups when the situational or problem contexts were varied by conflict, quality, and time conditions. The independent

variables of conflict, quality, and time were varied through presentation of simulated evaluation problems. The dependent variables included information needs and sources, and group process variables.

Theoretical Perspectives

Three theoretical perspectives formed the basis of this study: (1) communication theory by Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) provided a context for studying utilization-focused evaluation; (2) the conflict model of decision making by Janis & Mann (1977) provided a method for identifying problem contexts and criticalness of a decision; and (3) small group interaction theory by Ellis, Werbel, & Fisher (1978) provided a better understanding of a group's interaction with and relationship to the larger social system. These theories are described briefly along with their applicability to this study.

A systematic way to look at communication process is presented by Fishbein & Ajzen (1975). Three variables are identified which affect communication and they are source factors, message factors, and audience factors. This theory, otherwise stated as "who says what how to whom," has been used by others in research on utilization-focused evaluation (Braskamp, Brown & Newman, 1982; Brown, Newman, Rivers & Glock, 1982; Lorenzen & Braskamp, 1978). For the evaluator (source) to know what information is needed (message), the decision maker's needs and wants must be known (audience). This theoretical approach is

helpful in identifying researchable aspects of utilization-focused evaluation in its social context. For example, it may be that the status, expertise and sex of the source of information may have various affects on the decision maker (audience), or that a jargon-loaded or jargon-free evaluation report (message) may have different impacts on different decision makers (audience). Research by Braskamp, Brown & Newman (1980) reported that variance in these three factors affected how information was perceived and utilized.

The two other theoretical approaches reviewed for this study also contained an element of interaction in them. In the conflict model of decision making (Janis & Mann, 1977), the decision maker processes information from the environment to assess their potential loss (conflict), the reversibility of a decision (quality), the hope for a better solution, and the amount of time available (time). The combination of problem contexts affected the decision maker's psycho-emotional state and approach to decision making. The different psycho-emotional states have characteristic "cognitive styles" for decision making. Janis & Mann (1977) also state that there is a level of stress in all decisions and that there is an optimal level of stress for best decision-making behavior. Group tensity as defined by Ellis et al. (1978) is determined by the type of relationship a group has to its larger social environment. The direction in which information and energy flows from

the environment to the group determines a group's morphology. A group's relationship to its larger environment will affect the situational contexts of the problem to be solved.

On the basis of the review of literature, the following research questions were developed.

1. Do amount of time to make a decision, the quality of decision, and the conflict present individually affect or interact to affect group information use in decision making?

2. Do amount of time to make a decision, the quality of decision, and the conflict present individually affect or interact to affect group process or behavior in decision making?

Methodology

Participants in this study were 89 students enrolled in graduate level education classes at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Forty-one of the participants were women and 48 were men with a mean age of 32.3 years.

The study was conducted for an hour during regular class time. In all cases the study was integrated into the course content as a class exercise. Classes were selected which were conceivably related to aspects of the study. The experimental class's content contained issues of educational administration, decision making, evaluation or small group process, all of which were elements contained in the study. Participants were randomly assigned to

groups of 4 or 5 within the existing class structure. Four of the 20 total groups were videotaped either during the class meeting or times arranged otherwise for the participants.

The design of this study was a 2X2X2 factorial design with two fixed factors and one repeated measure factor. Factor 1 was conflict (High and Low) which was defined as the amount a person would lose or gain by internal or external criteria. Factor 2 was Quality (High and Low) and was defined as the ease of reversibility or degree of commitment to a decision. Factors 3 was Time (Long and Short). All groups had a long time (25 minutes) and short time (10 minutes) to make a decision. This design made it possible to make among group comparisons on High and Low Conflict and High and Low Quality factors. Groups were used twice to increase the possibility for intergroup comparison and to see if there were observable differences between groups when time allotted to make a decision was varied.

Dependent measures in this study included subjects responses to questions about their need and use of information in decision making on a Use of Information Form and their responses to semantic differentials on group perception. Observers filled out a Bales & Cohen (1979) SYMLOG-Adjective Rating Form for all participants. Interviews with participants and observers were also used to obtain more information on group use of information and process.

Videotapes of four groups were made and observed to assess the use of information and to study group behavior.

Two simulation evaluation reports were developed to provide controlled decision-making contexts. Each report contained a brief evaluative description of a school program which might be considered by a school board in real life. The problem evaluations were based on cases from newspaper stories, interviews with school administrators, and surveys of educators. Similar evaluation vignettes were used by Brown, Newman, Rivers & Glock (1982) in a field study using school board members which resulted in differences in the need for and use of information. The program results remained the same across situation contexts while aspects of conflict, quality, and time were varied around the program. The problems were basically the same as two used in the Brown, et al. (1982) study with modifications made in conflict and quality contexts.

Four to six trained observers accompanied the experimenter to the classes. After a brief introduction by the class instructor, the experimenter explained that this was a study on group decision making. They were asked to participate and filled out an Informed Consent Form if they chose to take part. The class members were randomly assigned to groups of four and five by an observer. All of the classrooms used allowed for the rearranging of tables and chairs or desks for group work within class.

After the groups were formed and settled, the observers handed each member in a group a packet of papers. The packets included the appropriate instructions, problems, and response forms. The observers also had a packet including instructions and SYMLOGS.

The instructions were read aloud by the experimenter. The participants then read their evaluation simulation problems and began their discussion. When half the time had elapsed the experimenter announced that half the time for making the decision was gone. After the first 25 minute period was over, the participants and observers filled out their forms if they had not started already. The experimenter then said, "It's taken too much time for the first problem. You now have only 10 minutes for the second problem." When 5 minutes had expired the experimenter told the groups that half their time was gone. After the 10 minute short time session forms were filled out by participants and observers.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses served to examine the two basic research questions:

1. There are no significant differences (main effects or interactions of conflict, quality, and time) in need or use of information in decision making.

2. There are no significant differences (main effects or interactions of conflict, quality, and time) in perceptions of group process or behavior.

Results

Quantitative Data

Hypothesis 1. There are no significant differences (main effects or interaction of conflict, quality, and time) in need or use of information for decision making.

Main Effects. The results showed one factor to be significant at the .01 level for one of the dependent measures. The quality context of the evaluation report affected the participants supporting the continuation of a program ($F=32.95$, $p<.001$). Participants were more likely to support the continuation of a "low quality" program. That is, the less commitment there was to the program in personnel and money over time, the easier it was to support. The difference in means between these two groups was greatest (high quality $x=2.79$ and low quality $x=1.97$) of all groups compared.

Interaction Effects. There were no significant three-way interaction effects for any of the dependent measures. Significant 2-way interaction effects were noted at the .01 level on three dependent measures. A two-way interaction of conflict and quality affected the preference for more time to decide ($F=13.91$, $p<.001$) and need for more information ($F=16.94$, $p<.001$). Examination of the cell means indicated the low conflict, low quality groups ($x=3.12$) and high conflict, high quality groups ($x=2.87$) did not want more time to decide. However, the mixed level groups of low conflict, high quality ($x=2.43$)

and high conflict, low quality (x=2.37) did want more time to decide. The low conflict, low quality (x=2.33) and high conflict, high quality (x=2.26) groups responded less positively about wanting more information than the low conflict, high quality (x=1.63) and high conflict, low quality (x=1.81) groups. The third two-way interaction involved the effect of conflict and time on the participant's preference to talk to other board members ($F=7.96$, $p<.005$). Participants in short time, low conflict (x=2.02) and long time, high conflict (x=2.11) groups expressed more positively their preference to talk to other board members than did participants in long time, low conflict (x=2.35) and short time, high conflict (x=2.56) groups. Means and standard deviations for all groups in all eight questions are included in Table 1.

(INSERT TABLE 1)

Hypothesis 2. There are no significant differences (main effects or interaction of conflict, quality, and time) in perceptions of group and individual dynamics.

There were no significant main effects or interaction effects for this measure at the .01 level on the semantic differentials. An interaction effect of conflict and quality ($F=4.38$, $p<.04$)was noted at the $p<.05$ level. Means and standard deviations for all groups are included in Table 2 for both semantic differentials.

(INSERT TABLE 2)

Qualitative Data

Participants were also asked open-ended questions on the Use of Information Form to indicate what influenced their decision, who they would want to talk to, and what information they would like to have. A synthesis of responses for each item is included. Other qualitative data which was obtained and is reported here included: (1.) the SYMLOG Adjective Rating Form, (2.) interviews with participants, (3.) interviews with observers , and (4.) videotapes of four groups. These measures were to better describe and validate the reported decision-making process and group behavior dynamics.

What influenced? Responses were combined and presented by group in percentages. (See Table 3) There was some variance of percentages in the different groups, however, the combined percentages generally reflect what was important to decision makers. Responses percentages indicated 15% did not have enough information to decide, 48% did have enough information to decide, and 26% made decisions based on their personal experience.

(INSERT TABLE 3)

Of the information that was either used or where more was needed, percentage of the total combined responses indicated that information about students (21%), more about student grades/development (24%) and school personnel (counselors and teachers) (20%) was most frequently requested. These three groups accounted for 50 to 75 per

cent of responses among groups. Other types of needed information which were also mentioned included money (8%), group discussion (8%), and superintendent (6%).

Who to talk to? Percentage of all responses indicated the people mentioned were teachers (19%), students (15%), experts (11%), counselors (10%) and program participants (10%). Though there was some variance in percentages in the groups, these 5 sources were mentioned over 50% of the time. Others mentioned less frequently were board members, parents, principle, superintendent, evaluator and "other." Table 5 contains the responses by group and totaled in percentages by category.

(INSERT TABLE 4)

Information Needed? Responses were categorized and combined from all groups and are reported in Table 5. Thirty-three per cent of the responses requested information about the effectiveness of the program. Also, 17% wanted information from either applied or theoretical experts. Eight per cent wanted more information about money, funding or cost-benefits of the program.

(INSERT TABLE 5)

SYMLOG observer ratings of participants were combined by group context and their placement on a Field Diagram was determined (Bales & Cohen, 1979). All groups fell within the same vector of the Field Diagram and were close together. The vector was identified as UPF which suggests a dominant, friendly, task oriented group. This

vector is identified by Bales & Cohen (1979) as the placement for decision-making groups.

Participant Interviews indicated a degree of involvement and interest in the problem. Most participants noticed a difference in the group or their behavior from the first to second problem. A practice effect was mentioned by some as affecting their behavior. The information they needed and used was consistent with all the responses and the videotapes.

Observer Interviews indicated that participants were generally involved and interested in the problems. Frequency of participation and pace of group seemed quicker in the second group. This could have been either a practice effect or an actual effect of time.

Videotapes were used to verify contents of interviews and to determine level of involvement, ease of participation, and group differences in time variations. Videotapes verified all specific references made by participants in interviews. Self report as a measure appeared to be valid. It also appeared as though most of the participants were involved and participated in the decision-making process.

Discussion

This study is limited by weaknesses inherent in simulation research. Although simulation research has been useful in studying information use (Braskamp, Brown & Newman, 1982), the results from this study cannot be uncon-

ditionally applied to school boards. In this study, for example, the Superintendent is mentioned as a person to consult in less than 10% of the responses. In a study done with actual school boards (Brown, Newman, Rivers & Glock, 1982), the Superintendent was the most frequently mentioned source accounting for 49% [illegible]0% of the responses. The sample must be considered, [illegible]en, in making generalizations to school boards.

The experimental design does not test all elements of the conflict decision-making model. The conflict model assumes the decision makers may not even be motivated to act under a low involvement decision. There was no "no conflict" condition and the decision makers were told in the instructions to make a decision. Therefore, the decisions presented enough conflict to warrant their attention. Also, the Janis & Mann (1977) model presents a linear, sequential process. The tendency for significant two-way interactions indicates a possible horizontal expansion rather than strictly vertical movement. The one mixed group of high conflict, low quality could exist technically in the model, but the other mixed group of low conflict, high quality would not. The decision should contain enough conflict to engage the participants to get to their questioning of a quality condition. The experimental conditions forced participants to bring in dimensions which may not even be assessed in real life conditions. The experimental design did not include a

condition which would generate enough decisional conflict to induce extreme hypervigilance or panic. This would be necessary to fully fit the decision-making model. Because it is difficult to measure emotional involvement or arousal and it is doubtful that a simulated evaluation report would generate that much arousal, the results in the extreme high conflict, high quality must be viewed with caution. Perhaps enough decisional conflict was generated to make participants satisfied with the goodness of their decisions without needing more information or time to decide. That is to say, not wanting more information or time does not necessarily reflect a non-vigilant state.

Another explanation may be possible as to why the results do not fit the conflict model exactly. The conflict model was derived from individual decision-making processes. In a group context, the group behavior, process or interaction may also affect the linearity or sequential nature of the model. The conflict issue in a decision may affect one decision maker in the group where quality issues may affect another person more strongly. It may be that the Janis & Mann (1977) model may need specific revision for group applicability. Further research may be necessary to clarify this point.

Time was a significant interacting variable with conflict for the question about talking with other board members. The conflict model suggests that time greatly effects the psycho-emotional state and it was anticipated

that time would be a major variable in responses. This was not the case except in interaction with conflict when needing to talk to other board members. Several explanations are possible. One is the practice effect mentioned by the participants in their interviews and heard in comments by participants to the observer. The decisions were easier because they knew how their group worked together. Any notable time differerces were counteracted by a "practice" session. This could have been remedied by changing the groups around in the classroom for the second problem. Another consideration could be the relative difference in 25 minutes and 10 minutes. In some cases of low conflict, low quality both intervals may be long enough to make decisions. In other cases of high conflict, high quality neither time may be long enough. This may have been counteracted by having half the groups with the short decision time first then do the long time decision second. It also would have been useful to record the time each group took for their decisions. Total time taken for low conflict, low quality decisions may have been different than total time taken for high conflict/high quality decisions. This would have described the groups better. These possible changes in design should be considered in future research using time as a variable.

Considering the sample, the simulation nature of the study and methodological problems with time, the study

still lends some support to theory that contextual variables affect decision making (Janis & Mann, 1977; and Brown, Newman, Rivers & Glock, 1982). The results also tend to support the assertion that evaluation information use is influenced by "personal factors." (Patton, 1978; and Stecher, Alkin, & Flesher, 1981). Many participants mentioned that their own biases, beliefs and experiences were what affected making their decisions.

Conclusions

Understanding that situational problem contexts may have an effect on information needed and used by groups in decision making is of help to the evaluator in preparing a useful report. In some cases the evaluator may not want to provide too much information if the interest is low. It also may be that a lot of information is what the decision makers need and will use if there is enough personal involvement, belief there is a better solution, and enough time. An evaluator would want to consider the interactive relationship the group has with the larger social system. The nature of this relationship, which helps identify the problem contexts, affects information need and use in decision making and may possibly affect group behavior and perception.

REFERENCES

Bales, R. F. & Cohen, S. P., with Williamson, S. A. SYMLOG: A System for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups, New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Blanchard, P. D. Small group analysis and the study of school board conflict. Small Group Behavior, 1975, 6 (2), 229-237.

Braskamp, L. A. & Brown, R. D. Utilization of Evaluation Information. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1980.

Braskamp, L. A., Brown, R. D. & Newman, D. L. Studying evaluation utilization through simulations. Evaluation Review, 1982, 6 (1), 114-126.

Brown, R. D., Newman, D. L., Rivers, L. S., & Glock, R. F. An empirical investigation of the influence of contextual factors on school board evaluative decision making. Paper read at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, NY, NY. 1982.

Ellis, D. G. Werrel, W. S. & Fisher, B. A. Toward a systematic organization of groups. Small Group Behavior, 1978, 4, 451-467.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. Belief, attitudes, intention and behavior: an introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

Janis, I. L. & Mann, L. Decision making: a psychological analysis of conflict, choice and commitment. New York: Free Press, 1977.

Lorenzen, G. & Braskamp, L. Comparative influences of political cost/benefit and statistical evaluation information on administrative decision making.

Newman, D. Communication and theory and the Utilization of Evaluation. In Utilization of Evaluation Information Braskamp, R. C. & Brown, P. D. Eds. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1980.

Patton, M. Q. Utilization-focused evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.

Stecher, B. M. Alkin, M. C. & Flesher, G. Patterns of information use in school level decision making. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of evaluation, UCLA. 1981.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Group Responses on Use of Information Form Items by Quality, Conflict, and Time Factors*

	High Quality				Low Quality			
	High Conflict N=23		Low Conflict N=23		High Conflict N=22		Low Conflict N=21	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
LONG TIME								
1. Prefer to have more time	2.91	1.16	2.83	1.15	2.41	1.05	3.19	0.75
2. Board needs to be involved	1.91	0.90	1.78	0.80	1.59	0.67	2.14	0.85
3. Like to have a great deal more information	2.04	0.98	1.61	0.94	1.55	0.91	2.14	1.06
4. Like information from a knowledgeable consultant	2.04	0.93	1.87	0.92	1.95	1.00	2.24	1.00
5. Like informal personal contacts	1.96	0.88	2.00	1.02	2.14	0.92	2.38	0.92
6. Like to talk to other board members	2.13	0.97	2.18	0.63	2.10	0.90	2.52	0.87
7. Know enough to make decision	2.30	0.89	2.77	1.11	2.62	1.09	2.33	0.82
8. Support the program	2.35	1.40	2.86	1.06	1.71	0.85	1.71	0.90
SHORT TIME								
1. Prefer to have more time	2.83	1.19	2.04	1.07	2.33	1.20	3.05	0.72
2. Board needs to be involved	1.61	0.72	1.57	0.66	1.86	0.96	2.23	0.81
3. Like to have a great deal more information	2.48	0.90	1.65	0.83	2.10	1.00	2.50	0.67
4. Like information from a knowledgeable consultant	2.26	0.96	2.17	0.98	2.00	1.00	2.05	0.79
5. Like informal personal contacts	2.43	0.90	2.35	0.71	2.33	0.91	2.24	0.61
6. Like to talk to other board members	2.73	0.88	2.87	1.14	2.38	1.02	2.19	0.71
7. Know enough to make decision	2.23	0.92	2.57	0.90	2.43	0.98	2.14	0.83
8. Support the program	3.14	1.08	2.83	1.07	2.05	0.92	2.00	1.00

*1=Definitely Yes, 2=Probably Yes, 3=Probably Not, 4=Definitely Not

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Group Responses to Two Semantic Differentials by Quality, Conflict, and Time Factors*

	High Quality				Low Quality			
	High Conflict N=23		Low Conflict N=23		High Conflict N=22		Low Conflict N=21	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
LONG TIME								
Peceptions of Group as a Whole	67.65	14.17	66.43	6.76	64.50	15.54	67.14	10.69
Experience in the Group	67.26	13.29	65.48	9.96	66.45	15.86	66.23	15.10
SHORT TIME								
Perceptions of Group as a Whole	67.22	13.33	66.04	6.16	63.29	8.14	73.82	16.91
Experience in the Group	67.30	13.43	66.04	7.38	64.00	7.89	72.63	18.34

* A higher score represents more positive experience or satisfaction

Table 3

Information Used in Decision Making

by Conflict, Quality, and Time

(Percentage of Participant Responses)

		Evaluation Problem Context							
	Total Group	LC LQ LT	LC LQ ST	HC LQ LT	HC LQ ST	LC HQ LT	LC HQ ST	HC HQ LT	HC HQ ST
Not Enough Information	15	5	4	12	21	32	29	12	7
Enough Information	48	81	48	60	32	48	43	42	36
Personal Experience	26	10	43	24	16	8	24	35	43
No Response	11	5	4	4	32	12	5	12	14
SPECIFIC INFORMATION NEEDED AND USED									
Board Members	1	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Group Discussion	8	5	6	3	10	3	0	22	15
Superintendent	6	20	8	3	0	0	0	7	0
Students	21	15	22	28	25	17	16	19	29
Grades/Development	24	20	16	28	25	23	36	11	29
Money	8	10	0	17	0	10	10	7	9
Community	1	0	0	3	0	3	0	4	0
Personnel (Counselors, Teachers)	20	13	23	23	25	27	28	5	18
New Program	7	3	17	3	15	10	3	7	0
Quality	3	0	2	1	0	0	2	7	0
Conflict	1	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Time	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	0	0

Table 4

Who Group Members Would Like to Talk to

by Conflict, Quality, and Time

(Percentage of Participant Responses)

		Evaluation Problem Context							
	Total Group	LC LQ LT	LC LQ ST	HC LQ LT	HC LQ ST	LC HQ LT	LC HQ ST	HC HQ LT	HC HQ ST
Experts	11	11	7	8	24	5	16	11	10
Board Members	6	13	6	8	7	3	11	4	0
Evaluation	2	0	4	2	0	5	0	04	2
Superintendent	3	3	2	2	7	3	2	4	0
Students	15	16	17	13	12	15	7	17	20
Curric. & Inst.	3	0	6	0	2	2	4	4	5
Counselors	10	16	7	15	2	10	11	6	20
Commn/Elect	3	0	2	3	2	5	4	1	5
Teachers	19	16	24	20	19	21	11	17	20
Parents	7	0	6	7	5	10	9	10	5
Principal	7	8	6	10	7	5	9	7	0
Program Participants	10	11	11	8	7	8	13	10	10
Other	6	8	4	5	5	10	6	3	5
No Response		0	1	0	0	0	2	0	7

Table 5

Type of Information Wanted

by Conflict, Quality, and Time

(Percentage of Participant Responses)

		Evaluation Problem Context							
	Total Group	LC LQ LT	LC LQ ST	HC LQ LT	HC LQ ST	LC HQ LT	LC HQ ST	HC HQ LT	HC HQ ST
Effectiveness/Quality	33	43	30	29	40	17	28	36	42
Impressions/Opinions of:									
a. Program participants									
b. Other personnel	9	8	20	11	14	4	5	6	8
More Information re:									
a. Money	8	11	0	4	0	11	13	4	14
b. Prog. & participants	8	8	8	16	0	15	3	8	8
c. Theoretical Expert	11	10	16	9	17	8	21	8	6
d. Student Pop. in Gen'l	7	3	5	2	6	11	10	10	8
e. Tests, Grades	2	2	0	2	3	4	0	4	0
f. Teachers	5	0	5	4	3	8	5	10	4
g. Counselors	4	2	5	2	9	4	3	0	6
h. Applied Expert	6	7	5	7	6	11	3	2	4
i. Parents	2	2	0	9	0	4	0	8	0
j. Superintendent	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	2
k. Community	1	0	0	4	0	2	3	2	0
l. Other alternatives	4	5	5	4	0	6	8	0	6
No Response	15	2	0	0	3	1	2	0	7